

Editor, Book World
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

6/13/93

Dear Editor,

The wise-cracking that is not wise at all, the ignorance that is conspicuous and the careless, unthinking writing, like David Streitfeld's (Book World 6/13/93) that typifies so-called reviews of so-called books on the JFK assassination contributed greatly to the success of the enormity of books that have little or nothing to do with the established facts of that assassination and its official investigations. Their authors are self-presented Perry Masons when in fact most are apprentice Keystone Kops, junior grade.

Streitfeld, who can hardly have done the work required to offer the opinion (in fact, he makes it as a bald statement) that there is no proof that there was a conspiracy:

"If there truly were a definitive answer, incontrovertible, inarguable proof of conspiracy... the market for these books would dry up."

In fact the very first book on the Warren Report, my Whitewash: the Report on the Warren Report, dating to 1965, does precisely that. As do my other five books on that assassination. And all come from the official evidence itself. I am the one whose books espouse no theories of any kind. And the market hasn't dried up at all. And will not be because of the significance of the crime, the great national interest in it and the widespread dissatisfaction ^{act} exploited by the commercializers of untenable theories none of which is proven.

The superficiality and unthinking quality of Streitfeld's commentary is typified by what he says about Gerald Posner's coming Case Closed Closed: "...computer enhancements of the Zapruder film of the shooting to come ~~is~~ up with the shocking conclusion that the Warren Report was right: that Oswald acted alone."

Aside from the fact that this is not at all the book Posner described to me and for which he interviewed me for the several days he and his wife were here, how in the world can interviews or any enhancement of that amateur film prove that the Warren Report was right? In the simplest of the many disproofs, how can any film record shots that did not strike a victim, or missed entirely? Obviously, that is not possible.

As has always applied to all writers, as your George Lardner can and I think will confirm, the Posners had unsupervised access to the about a quarter of a million once-withheld pages of government records that I got by a series of FOIA lawsuits and access to our copier. If he were intent upon writing the book Streitfeld describes, could he possibly have exhausted that much official information in a couple of days?

Whatever led Posner to shift to what can at best be only a rehashing of the official mythology from his ^{planned} assessment of the critics, it should be obvious that with the enormous amount of information that for years has been available no honest statement of support for

the tragic official mythology can be based only on "dozens of new interviews" and that nonsense about the magic applied to the much-used Zapruder film.

But before publication this newest of the major commercializations and exploitations has been plugged hard by the Post and among others, Publishers Weekly.

Had the media and its reviewers not failed to meet their responsibility the great glut of profitable trash that has so sadly deceived and misled the people could not have been as successful and so confused the still ^{poor} sorrying people.

Harold Weisberg

7627 Old Receiver Road

Frederick, Md. 21702

Harold Weisberg

Sorry about my typing. It cannot be any better.